TELLS THE FACTS AND NAMES THE NAMES

CounterPunch

MARCH 16-31, 2009 ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR VOL. 16, NO. 6

The Future of the Everglades

By Alan Farago

In late May 2003, the EPA administrator Christine Todd Whitman – now an advocate for the nuclear power industry – resigned from the Bush administration. In Florida, this set off a flurry of speculation that the president would appoint to the top EPA post one of Gov. Jeb Bush's key lieutenants, state environmental chief David Struhs. Struhs was an architect of the Jeb Bush 2003 plan to declare victory in Everglades restoration, by rewriting pollution law in the Everglades so that violations would disappear. The Florida legislature needed no further persuasion.

At time, the annual session of the Florida legislature had wound down. Its most controversial achievement: a miserable new law changing the settlement agreement between the federal government and Florida, allowing the sugar companies' pollution of the Everglades without enforceable standards, timelines or penalties. Big Sugar had its good reasons to change the 1992 law that required no more effluent be discharged into the Everglades by the firm, agreed upon deadline of 2006: it couldn't meet the 10 parts per billion phosphorous standard, determined to be protective of the Everglades. The new measure was nicknamed "The Everglades Whenever Act."

Phosphorous, a constituent in fertilizer, wreaks havoc on Florida wetlands when it is present in even minute quantities, likened to the equivalent of five grains in a bucket of sand.

The sugar lobby arrived at the 2003 session of the legislature en masse, overwhelming legislators. Gov. Bush persuaded a bipartisan majority to approve the legislation – despite an enormous clamor from environmentalists, scientists, news-

FARAGO CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

McCarthyism and Middle Eastern Studies
A Frenchwoman's Disillusioning Journey from Iraq to an Upstate N.Y. Campus

By Victoria Fontan

Viciously strident on some campuses, deviously low-key on others, there's a McCarthyite campaign in full spate across higher education in the U.S. today. In the sights of the witch-hunters are junior and senior faculty targeted as "anti-Israel", as terror-symps, as leftists. For every headline case, like Norman Finkelstein or Joseph Mashad or Juan Cole, there are three or four less publicized smear campaigns, methodical onslaughts to derail a hiring, head off a tenure appointment, disinvite a speaker, fence off the campus from all dangerous thoughts. The consequence: a climate of fear, of methodical censorship, of cowardice.

A woman on a Midwest campus, constantly on the receiving end of such assaults read the personal history by Victoria Fontan we print here and remarked that line after line struck a chord: the imputations to female targets protesting their treatment of "hysteria", or "paranoia", of unscholarly bias, the volunteer student stoolie filing his report like a FBI field agent, the previously supportive faculty suddenly all running for cover. As she said, bludgeon or soft shoe, "It happens all the time." As the poet William Empson wrote in "Missing Dates", "Slowly the poison the whole bloodstream fills." AC/JSC.

A "badge of honor" – this is what my colleagues, readers and students frequently refer to when becoming aware of my one-year experience at Colgate University. I am told that I should be "proud" of myself, since my research is now "vindicated" and everything I claimed or wrote about the Iraq war has now filtered into common knowledge and public consciousness. A majority of Americans now believe that the Iraq war was a mistake, and are in favor of a withdrawal. The failure of U.S. policy in Iraq is making prime time on CNN, and an increasing number of columnists are commenting on the impact that humiliation of victim populations has on conflict escalation. More importantly, yesterday's enemies, nationalist insurgent groups, are now U.S. allies in fighting al-Qaeda in Sunni Muslim parts of the country.[1] All in all, my research now seems to be in very good company. The issue, however, is that badges of honor do not pay the bills, and certainly do not make anyone's career. In addition, they do not keep anyone safe!

My claim to this "badge of honor," which I once would have traded any day for a conventional academic career path, is to have carried out research on the effect of humiliation on the escalation of political violence, in both post-Saddam Iraq and postwar Lebanon, and to have engaged in action research in the field on several occasions between 2001 and 2004. Here I intend to describe how my research, teaching and writings were repressed by different sources, both within and outside my academic institution during the 2003-2004 year, and how this repression led me to leave U.S. academia.

Of particular importance will be an illustration of the mechanisms that cur-

FONTAN CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FARAGO CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

paper editorial boards, and even some prominent Republican legislators in Congress like former Broward representative Clay Shaw.

Bush critics worried that the fundamental changes to the 1992 law would cause Congress to abandon federal commitments to fund fully its share of the original $8 billion cost of the original restoration plan, memorialized in Congress in 2000. At the time, they were right. Since that time, the projected cost has doubled.

In the 2003 legislative session, Struhs outright lied when he testified that the sugar bill, unceremoniously nicknamed the "Everglades Whenever Act," had the support of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Once the bill passed committee, he retracted his remark. Once the bill was signed into law, Governor Bush and his emissaries worked mightily to defend it as a step forward for the Everglades under the premise: say a thing long enough, and it will be taken for the truth.

The new law attracted instant attention in the Miami courtroom, where Everglades' issues had been on the front burner for more than a decade. On July 29, 2008, Judge Alan Gold ruled in favor of the Tribe and Friends, joining in a string of stinging rulings against government like the July 2007 federal ruling against the illegal permitting of 5,400 acres of wetland destruction in the East Everglade by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: "The Corps simply has failed to abide by its governing regulations, and its failure to disclose the benzene contamination to the public, and to this Court, and to consider it fully is the most egregious example of these failures. The Corps' approval of this mining is contrary to the directives of (several federal environmental laws)."

Judge Gold's decision was a sharp rebuke to the claim by Gov. Bush that the pollution law rewrite had moved Everglades' restoration forward. Putting dirty water into the Everglades is against the law. He also ruled that the state of Florida cannot issue permits that allow the discharge of dirty water into impacted or unimpacted areas. Although there was no specific remedy proposed, the federal court introduced enough uncertainty that one of the principal lawbreakers, U.S. Sugar, decided to sell its land to the state of Florida. Today, Florida's cratering economy, pushed by steady pressure from the billionaire Fanjul sugar interests, is threatening the U.S. Sugar deal.

Judge Gold ruled: "... the Florida legislature ... violated its fundamental commitment and promise to protect the Everglades."

Today, the Florida legislature is unmoved and apparently immune from the consequences of its actions, because of a permanent incumbency and revolving door between lobbyists, regulated industry and political insiders. Its latest effort – accompanied by the same rounds of broad-based media criticism as the law favoring sugar judged in federal court to be illegal – is to eviscerate wetlands regulation by the state and measures intended to "manage" growth. Both fallacies occur under the banner of encouraging a strong economy in order to afford the costs of protecting the environment.

Bush's consigliere, David Struhs, did not clear the short list for EPA chief. He is now a top executive for International Paper, a corporation involved in complex regulation while he was Florida's environmental chief. "The Department of Environmental Protection secretary resigned to work for a polluter – a polluter for whom he engineered a bailout with public money. Mr. Struhs' decision to become vice president of environmental affairs at International Paper Co., the $25 billion-a-year company that is the world's largest paper products firm, sums up his five-year record much more clearly than the happy-talk testimonial to himself and Gov. Bush, who hired him. Mr. Struhs began working to help International Paper shortly after the firm bought a paper mill near Pensacola in 2000. The mill has not met state water-quality standards since 1989, discharging 24 million gallons of waste daily into area waterways. All along, DEP backed off from strict enforcement; the plant employs nearly 1,000 people, and politicians worried about how International Paper might react. Meanwhile, the water got dirtier." "Struhs sold out Florida to cash in for himself," *Palm Beach Post*, Feb 4, 2004.)

An obscure 2007 EPA report notes that at least half the remnant Everglades are contaminated with excessive levels of phosphorous, measured from 1,270 locations in the Everglades; a 50 per cent increase from a 1995-1996 analysis.

Whitman is lobbying in private practice for two new nuclear reactors that will cost ratepayers more than $18 billion. "Nuclear is expensive, no doubt about it," says former EPA head Christine Todd Whitman, now a paid spokeswoman for the industry. "But we can't keep saying no to everything." ("Nuclear's Comeback: Still No Energy Panacea," *Time Magazine*, Dec. 31, 2008.) She was succeeded in the Bush White House by a functionary so colorless and of such little consequence the world cannot remember his name.

Recently, President Obama appointed a new chief for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Rock Salt, former district engineer of the Corps in Jacksonville, has been a long-time, senior level intermediary within the bureaucracy and between industry and government. He was there like Forrest Gump, and knows every single point of the Everglades restoration mess. Whether General Salt can represent "change we believe in," given the Everglades' record of compromise, inefficiency, violations of federal law, and a steadfast belief in engineering solutions that wouldn't pass an Optimist Club smell test, remains to be seen. **CP**

Alan Farago writes on the environment and politics from Coral Gables, Florida, and can be reached at alanfarago@yahoo.com.

CounterPunch

EDITORS
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Alevtina Rea

BUSINESS
Becky Grant
Deva Wheeler

DESIGN
Tiffany Wardle

COUNSELOR
Ben Sonnenberg

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org
All rights reserved.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FONTAN CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

rently allow young academics to be flushed out of U.S. universities before being able to prove themselves as scholars and teachers, such as result from weak or nonexistent solidarity and support networks. Nor are established faculty members immune from the threat of eviction. Consequently, I also examine here what systems might promote greater solidarity among critical or controversial scholars who face repression in their academic work.

My original sin

I was raised in a conservative family in Brittany, in northwest France. Throughout my entire childhood, I saw reports on television on terrorism in Corsica and the Basque country. I also learned about the Algerian War, and why bomb attacks shook Paris from time to time. All these recurring news stories made me question the motivations that would lead human beings to injure or kill one another. I wanted to know who the individuals behind these attacks were, what motivated them, and how they saw us. If we considered them as brutal, heartless, evil people, how did they regard the French?

After studying politics at the University of Sussex, in the U.K., and being exposed to a version of the Algerian War that I would never have been encountered in France, I became interested in the politics of the Arab world. A course on Lebanese politics led me to embark on a doctoral study on peace building in Lebanon. As soon as I arrived in Beirut in January 2001, I realized the strategic importance of the Hezbollah, known in Lebanon as the Party of God, considered there to be a political party just like any other. My overall thesis was that since none of the issues that had plunged the country into a 17-year civil war had been resolved, if the country was to refrain from falling into conflict again, it would need the commitment of the Hezbollah as a powerful political broker.

My research, it seems, was not too much off the mark, because recent developments in Lebanon seem to point toward the same conclusion. Intrigued by the role played by the Hezbollah in Lebanese politics and social life, I set out to analyze their public diplomacy, ideas, social following, and so on. Since many colleagues of the American University of Beirut's Centre for Behavioral Research had already made contact with them, I did the same. After all, I was enrolled in an Irish university, and the European Union had not yet placed the Hezbollah on its terrorist list. So I opened the Yellow Pages, looked to the Political Parties' offices section, and found the phone number of their press office. As they were used to meeting academic researchers even from the U.S., they received me. After a few preparatory meetings, they gave me carte blanche to contact any of their social institutions

Professor Monk expressed reservations about the value of researching insurgencies. Was it not a rather empirically based topic? What was my methodology in the field? Had I gone in front of the ethics committee?

for the sake of my research. I spent the next two years carrying out participant observation with many of their institutions, women's groups, girls' summer classes, agricultural development centers and hospitals. Because Hezbollah's military affairs were not the focal point of my research, however, I never observed any military activities or trainings.

Upon successfully defending my thesis in the spring of 2003, I saw in the overthrow of Saddam Hussein the potential for another Hezbollah to establish itself in a Middle Eastern country, this time in Iraq. As I knew nothing about that country, I asked the Hezbollah press office to help me arrange interviews with their Iraqi partners – SCIRI -- once I reached Baghdad. They gave me a letter and a phone number.

I set off for Baghdad the next day, working as a research assistant for a journalist, uncertain of where I would stay or whom I would meet, and with my letter of introduction. After a first disappointing meeting at the Baghdad SCIRI headquarters, where my letter was confiscated and no one seemed to know what was happening, I realized that I had to keep my eyes open for alternative research material.

A few days later, our news team arrived in Fallujah. As tensions between U.S. troops and residents rose, due to a shootout on April 28, 2003, we witnessed a series of U.S. raids over the following weeks.[2] I saw burned-out U.S. soldiers trying to uphold their perception of what constitutes security, facing a crowd of residents concerned with their own safety and, more importantly, their individual and collective honor. In a society where honor and vengeance are of utmost importance, violence was bound to escalate rapidly.

After witnessing many misunderstandings that turned violent, I decided to study the impact of humiliation on conflict escalation in post-Saddam Iraq. I went to several Sunni Muslim parts of the country, interviewed various ordinary people, lived with some of them, and slowly began to come up with an Iraqi-based analysis of conflict escalation in post-Saddam Iraq.[3]

I was not the only foreigner in Iraq to realize the importance of humiliation in conflict escalation: al-Qaeda also did. In a few months, during which some ordinary people organized themselves into

Subscription Information

Subscription information can be found at www.counterpunch.org or call toll-free inside the U.S. 1-800-840-3683

Published twice monthly except July and August, 22 issues a year.

1- year hardcopy edition $45
2- year hardcopy edition $80
1- year email edition $35
2- year email edition $65
1- year email & hardcopy edition $50
1- year institutions/supporters $100
1- year student/low income, $35

Renew by telephone, mail or on our website. For mailed orders please include name, address and email address (if applicable) with payment. To renew by phone 1-800-840-3683 or 1-707-629 3683. Add $17.50 per year for subscriptions mailed outside the U.S.A.

Make checks or money orders payable to:
CounterPunch
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nationalist insurgency movements, others answered the calls of Islamic fundamentalism and al-Qaeda. Throughout the initial months of the invasion of Iraq, the U.S. administration realized that it was losing the initiative, and initiated a propaganda war vilifying both nationalist and al-Qaeda-based movements. Under this framing of the Iraqi conflict, any attempt to separate the two movements or to understand the underlying factors that spurred violence was labeled as "condoning terrorism." Once the coalition decided to administer Iraq its way, my research became controversial overnight.[4]

Lesson Number One: Do not be interviewed by anyone other than your future boss

As I completed my first academic article on the escalation of violence in Fallujah, I was invited to speak by various East Coast Universities in the spring of 2004, among them the United States Military Academy at West Point and Colgate University. After a very successful intervention at West Point, I arrived at Colgate to make a presentation that turned into an interview for the position of visiting assistant professor of Peace Studies for the following academic year. My stay at Colgate was a great success. It did not feel as though I was being interviewed at all but more like I was meeting compatible colleagues who seemed eager to learn about my research, and whose research was also of great interest to me. The day that I spent on campus was an absolute joy, and we parted with the idea that I might be a good fit for the department.

A few days later, I was asked by the acting head of the Peace Studies Program, professor Nancy Ries, who had welcomed me with such warmth at Colgate, to have a conversation with the future head of the program, professor Dan Monk, who was being recruited with tenure at the same time as me. He called me from Israel where he was spending a sabbatical year and spoke about teaching loads and expectations that we both had from one another's perspective.

As I had just obtained a good offer of contract extension from the Turkish institution, at which I was then teaching, I wanted to leave Turkey only for a place with even better potential. I made it clear to professor Monk that I would be looking toward staying for a tenure track at Colgate, while applying for other positions elsewhere. He did not exclude the possibility of my possible stay at Colgate beyond one year, but also said that he could not promise a tenure-track position in Peace Studies for that year. As he sounded positive and it was possible that I could stay beyond my first visiting year, I was not alarmed. A few days later, I was notified that my candidacy was successful. I arrived at Colgate in early August.

Eager to meet my new boss, I made it to work only a few hours after landing at Syracuse Airport. We met and agreed to share lunch. Nor long into our meal, a black cloud started to form over the table. After I spoke about my Ph.D. research on the Hezbollah and my latest article on Iraq, professor Monk expressed reservations about the value of researching insurgencies. Was it not a rather empirically based topic? What was my methodology in the field? Had I gone in front of the ethics committee? My Ph.D. was from the University of Limerick, where was that?

The conservative blog, Little Green Footballs, falsely reported that I was "negotiating to be embedded with the car-bombing, head-chopping mujahideen in Iraq." Early comments from readers ranged from "Rachel Corrie's soul sister" to "useful idiot."

Then came a discussion on Israel. As I knew of his sabbatical research there, I felt that our fields, experiences and approaches would be complementary. Speaking about the separation built between Palestinian and Israeli areas, however, we had quite different outlooks. When he spoke of a fence, I spoke of a wall. A fence for me was something that my dog could dig under, and since we were both dog lovers, I drew the contrast to a wall that is truly a wall. He replied that the separation wall was much more of a fence than a wall. I replied that the Berlin Wall also was more of a fence than a wall, but that it was still called a wall. Clearly, our conversation was going nowhere. Our approaches were not to be complementary. By the end of this lunch, and on my first day in the U.S.A., I realized that it was a dreadful shame that he had not been there for my campus interview, because if this was the case I would never have been hired. This is a lesson learned for both of us: be on campus to recruit and to be recruited. On that day, I knew that I would not stay at Colgate beyond my one-year renewable contract, and that I had made a serious mistake in leaving Turkey. The rest of the year would prove to be one humiliation after another.

Lesson Number Two: Whatever you do, do not be "hysterical"!

After I arrived, I first had to find a suitable teaching load, as this had been mentioned during my interview. Understandably, I wanted to stay as close to my specialty as possible because I also wanted to use the coming year for research, publication, and a job search. After being asked to submit a syllabus for a course on Core Middle East by professor Safi, I was told that the institutional need had switched from Core Middle East to Core Israel, and that professor Monk would be teaching it. The reason invoked for this was twofold: first, there was no longer any institutional need in Middle Eastern studies; second, I did not speak Arabic fluently, hence was not qualified to teach the Core Middle East course.

This was the first in a long line of harassments in relation to my scholarship: how could I be a Middle East expert and not speak the language fluently? While true to one extent, French, my mother tongue, is spoken widely in Lebanon and equipped me to understand much of the political discourse. By the look of the debacle of the U.S. invasion of Iraq, precipitated by many Iraqi exiles that had little idea of how their country should be run, I felt that my contribution to the academic debate surrounding this part of the world would be as valid as anyone's. Nonetheless, I embarked on Arabic lessons to show good will and to better fit departmental needs. Maybe I would be worthy of teaching the Core Middle East course in the next academic year if I was asked to stay.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doing research for the journalist Robert Fisk in order to be financially able to go to Iraq in 2003, I had to spend a few weekends off campus, either to fly to Paris or Dublin in the fall of 2004, to work as a researcher on his book.[5] I was told that spending weekends abroad did not show my commitment to the Colgate community, and that working with Fisk made me more of a journalist than an academic. True, but collaborating with Fisk allowed me to initiate groundbreaking research in post-Saddam Iraq, and did that not count for anything?

Then came the attacks on my scholarship. I had sent an article on humiliation and political violence for review to professor Monk. He dismissed the article, accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal *Peace and Change*.[6] He criticized my focus on humiliation and disparaged my network of scholars – many of whom are anchored at Columbia University – as unworthy of my time.

I reduced my trips to Europe, focused on writing according to professor Monk's standards, and worked hard to teach in the best way possible. My teaching load still had not been finalized, and I hoped to be able at least to repeat one class in the second term. This was not possible as my War, State, and Society class was given to a colleague. Instead of repeating this or at least teaching something in my research area, I was given a Core Modernity course, starting with Darwin's theory of evolution.

Because this was a core curriculum course, I only had a 20 per cent space for material of my own choice. I decided to focus on the theme of conflict and tried to introduce Joe Sacco's book, *Palestine.* Professor Monk said it was inappropriate, as it might alienate Jewish students. I then made the mistake in writing in an email to him that I did not mind being "burned at the stake" for introducing the book to my class. Professor Monk said that this email could make me look hysterical if people that did not know me saw it. He added, in front of professor Ries, that writing this as such was an error of judgment.

All they had left to discredit was my teaching. The problem was that I had excellent student reviews. My program head sat in on two of my classes, but because his background was architecture, he did not have much to say about my theoretical take on ethnicity. However, as I like to illustrate concepts with facts, this was used against me. My student reviews, he said, were too good and probably illustrated my reliance more on facts than theories. According to him, I was more of an entertainer than a professor. Students seemed not to challenge my teaching enough, which led him to think that, again, I was some sort of a glorified journalist.

After all this, one December morning, professor Monk called me in his office, with professor Ries, who had recruited me, present. Professor Monk informed me that my contract would not be renewed for the next academic year. In his benevolent mercy, he promised to help me be a better scholar and to find a job elsewhere. As I broke the news to some colleagues and students, I could only hear incredulity. How could this happen? How could I fall from grace at Colgate so quickly?

I realized two things. First, Colgate had given up on me and was hoping to lock me in their attic until I made it out of campus. Second, my colleagues seemed to be afraid that somehow my disgrace was contagious.

Lesson Number Three: Do not allow anyone to frame your research as "subversive"

I went to Iraq during the semester break to continue research and search for a new position. A colleague from the Columbia University Iraq Program gave me the details of a few universities in Northern Iraq that might be interested in having me the next academic year. On the day I reached Erbil, I was offered a position. I felt that I was saved and that I could never be called a bad scholar again because I would be able to learn both Arabic and Kurdish. When I returned to Colgate, many students told me that they wanted me to stay, that they would fight for me. Yet this is when the internal Colgate conflict became even larger and more damaging to my career.

One morning, the Colgate press office issued a release stating that I had been "embedded" with the Iraqi insurgency during the semester break.[7] This was in January 2005, at a time when the official Bush administration line was that all insurgent activities in post-Saddam Iraq were terrorist activities. Had I been "embedded" with terrorists? Absolutely not. I had only met with local Iraqi people who either had engaged or were going to take part in insurgent activities as a result of a individual or collective humiliation. In some parts of Iraq, this meant a lot of people.

As soon as I saw the press release, I made it very clear to the press office that I had never been embedded with insurgent planning or carrying out any insurgent activity. I had only met with regular Iraqis, and never with al-Qaeda or any group of this type. But the damage was done. Soon angry emails started to reach the Colgate press office. A few days later, neoconservative forums started to demonize my research. The California-based conservative blog, Little Green Footballs, falsely reported that I was "negotiating to be embedded with the car-bombing, head-chopping mujahideen in Iraq." Early comments from readers ranged from "Rachel Corrie's soul sister" to "useful idiot."[8] Once my office phone number was posted on the blog, I received a torrent of abusive messages. As readers became increasingly polarized about my research, their posts called for me to be beheaded in the same way that *The Wall Street Journal* correspondent Daniel Pearl had been, to die in a car bomb, to be abducted, and so on.[9] Other blogs raised the stakes by enjoining U.S. soldiers to kill me while in Iraq, urging that I be hanged for treason, or implying that I was a Nazi sympathizer.[10]

A few days later, a new blog appeared with a fake interview of me claiming that I had engaged in embedded research with KKK "freedom fighters" and that "if we would only listen, they wouldn't have to resort to lynching."[11] As grotesque as this assertion might seem, professor Monk felt it necessary to ask if I had ever been in Chicago and spoken those words.

By then, the university press office was receiving angry emails from the public and from veteran alumni who threatened to cut off their funding.[12] This raised alarm bells for the university press office,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which decided to publish a statement correcting the previous release that mentioned me being "embedded" with the Iraqi insurgency.[13]

Instead of standing by me, one by one, my close colleagues stood aloof and silent. Professor Monk publicly distanced himself from my research, quoted in a Colgate press release that "this was entirely [my] own research, [that] it was unaffiliated with Colgate."[14]

At this stage, Fox News was taking an interest in the controversy and wanted me to be interviewed with Bill O'Reilly. The dean of the faculty, professor Lyle Roelofs, discouraged me from appearing on the program. Then it was professor Ries' turn, as she expressed worry that O'Reilly would "humiliate" me. She said that the conservative e-magazine *FrontPage* had inquired about me and confessed, in words I vividly recall, "Horowitz is after you, I am terrified."

At this point, I realized two things. First, Colgate had given up on me and was hoping to lock me in their attic until I made it out of campus. Second, my colleagues seemed to be afraid that somehow my disgrace was contagious. A few colleagues comforted me, in private, and I will always be grateful to them for this. In public, however, it was a West Point colleague, professor Scott Silverstone, who alone defended my research by saying that it was extremely useful to the cadets and that I was "doing a valuable academic and, more broadly, policy service."[15] Colgate made it obvious to me that I was not to speak with any media outlets.

A last straw came from a first-year student who had arrived in my office purporting to ask for help in becoming a journalist. His name was Mark Bello. As I wanted to help and mentor students in any way possible in my last few months at Colgate, I gave him two afternoons of my time, where I described the life of a journalist. I told him about how I had gotten to where I was academically, what I had witnessed in Iraq and gave him some pointers on how to succeed as a journalist. I did not hear from him for a few weeks, until his interview "notes" appeared on a Colgate conservative student website. The students running the site were engaged in a dispute with the university administration over its selling of chapter houses, and had used me in their goal to discredit the university in any possible way.[16]

By the look of it, this student's shot at journalism will make him a prime candidate to work in a tabloid newspaper. The "notes" published on the net under the title "Fontan in Iraq" are exaggerated, distorted, and often outright false. Sadly, they are still available online for anyone to read. While Bello states that I met with the wife of Abu Musab Zarqawi while in Jordan, I actually said that my newspaper's fixer in Jordan, Mayada al-Askari, had met her as CNN was looking to interview her. Where he states that I "brag" about my Hezbollah ties, I simply said that I carried out participant observation with their social outlets in Beirut, an activity that many other Ph.D. students were engaged in at the same time.[17]

While conservative blogs seized on the Colgate press release and spread it like wildfire, I had no support or solidarity. No academic left-wing or liberal network was there to systematically pick up on every new case, as the conservative side did so well from their point of view.

A few weeks after this interview was posted, as I prepared to leave the U.S. for Iraq, I received an email from professor Ries, telling me that she no longer could act as an academic referee for me because she could not write "unambiguous" letters about my tenure at Colgate. That is when I realized that the public extension of the conflict that had begun with my program head would cost me an academic career in the U.S.

Lesson Number Four: Build a network

Reflecting on the unfolding of those events and the reactions that I now get when asked about this painful period of my life and career, I realize that what I was lacking was a strong network of advisers. While conservative blogs seized on the Colgate press release and spread it like wildfire, I had no support or solidarity. No academic left-wing or liberal network was there to systematically pick up on every new case, as the conservative side did so well from their point of view. Was it because my research was not high profile enough? Because I was not tenured? Because I was a foreigner? After all, several U.S. journalists had embedded themselves with the insurgency while the controversy was developing around my research, and nothing happened to them.[18] Some reasons can be put forward in connection to this at several levels.

First, as professor Ries' reaction illustrates, many academics are terrified to be pilloried as I was, and hence kept a low profile. Very few were the colleagues who checked in with me on a daily basis to give me advice, express their support, or simply to see how I was holding up. Professor Jennifer Loewenstein, who was exposed to far more vilification than I, called me almost every day from Wisconsin.

My e-lynching occurred at the same time as the Ward Churchill case. Had a critical mass of academics come together as a united front to defend Churchill, numerous others and me, it could have launched a debate on how common academic repression actually is. By approaching these injustices on a case-by-case basis, however, no sense of collective and systemic repression of scholars was allowed to emerge. This meant that scholars have been flushed out of U.S. academia. After all, what I wrote and said shortly after the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq is now official U.S. policy in the Sunni parts of Iraq – it is called the "Sunni Awakening," whereby yesterday's insurgent groups are today's allies.[19] While I was shot down for differentiating between insurgent and terrorist groups a few years ago, this important distinction is now commonplace.

Epilogue: Research is one's best defense

I left for Iraq, worried for my own safety, because a colleague, Marla Ruzicka, had been killed by a car bomb in Iraq a few weeks earlier. Penniless, I had no other choice than to press ahead with my exile, and I finally took an offer from the University for Peace, in Costa Rica, to join them forthwith as a program director in International Peace Studies.

Overnight, my gray exile turned to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold. I found a group of like-minded colleagues, evolving in an institution displaying horizontal management practices and catering for exceptional students. In my three years at the University for Peace, I have never felt humiliated, disrespected, or sidelined as an academic. I often say that I died at Colgate and reached heaven at UPeace. My recruitment, however, almost never took place. After my search committee reached a consensus on preselected candidates, the then dean of the faculty, professor Amr Abdalla, "googled" me and found all the sites mentioned above. Yet, with insight and integrity rare among academics, he realized that my research had been repressed and chose not to volunteer his findings to the rest of the search committee, as he felt that such information" would in turn make the committee biased for or against me. I was, therefore, only to be recruited on my academic merit. Professor Abdalla gave me a chance that I try to honor every single day since I started to work for UPeace. I now work directly under him as leader of a project facilitating the establishment of MA Programs in Peace and Conflict Studies in 16 universities worldwide.[20] I have also just been promoted to the rank of associate professor, an achievement I would never have thought possible only three years ago.

Academic institutions are not alone in typing my name into a search engine: someone at Homeland Security did the same and put me on a "terrorist" watch list. Consequently, since February 2007, every time that I step out of a U.S.-bound plane, I am met right outside the plane by Homeland Security officers who escort me for questioning. Every episode supersedes the last. On a recent trip to Washington, D.C., I was even interrogated by the FBI at Miami Airport. In every one of these interviews, I meet intelligent professionals who understand and are interested in my research. I have actually gotten to the point where I look forward to catching up with some of those officers when I pass through Miami airport.

Still, as the U.S.A. moves ever closer to a total surveillance system and a menacing garrison state, I never know what will happen to me. Will I be branded as an "enemy combatant," stripped of my constitutional rights, and sent to Guantanamo Bay? Although the state and academic complex seeks to stifle thought, criticism and dissent, I know that my research is my best advocate in times like this.[21]
CP

Victoria Fontan can be reached at vfontan@upeace.org.

[1] Cockburn, P. "If there is no change in three months, there will be war again," *The Independent*. London: 2008.

[2] *Violent Response: The U.S. Army in al-Falluja*. New York, Human Rights Watch. 2003.

[3] Fontan, V. "Polarization between occupier and occupied in Post-Saddam Iraq: humiliation and the formation of political violence." *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 2006, 18(2): 217-238.

[4] Bremer, L. P. *My Year in Iraq: The Struggle to Build a Future of Hope*. New York, Simon and Schuster: 2006.

[5] Fisk, R. *The Great War for Civilization: The Conquest of the Middle East*. London, Fourth Estate Publishers: 2005.

[6] *I subsequently withdrew this article from Peace and Change* and incorporated it in my forthcoming *Voices from Post-Saddam Iraq: Living with Terrorism, Insurgency and New Forms of Tyranny* book as Chapter 4.

[7] http://www.colgate.edu/DesktopDefault1.aspx?tabid=730&pgID=6013&nwID=3484.

[8] http://www.littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=14483&only.

[9] http://www.littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=14483&only.

[10] http://wizbangblog.com/content/2005/01/27/university-professorphp.

[11] http://www.groupsrv.com/hobby/about135661.html.

[12] http://pierrelegrand.net/2005/01/27/the-email-i-sent-to-colgate-protesting-this-shameful-behavior.htm

[13] http://media.www.maroon-news.com/media/storage/paper742/news/2005/03/04/News/Peace.Studies.Professors.Research.Causes.Conflict-886076.shtml; http://www.colgate.edu/DesktopDefault1.aspx?tabid=730&pgID=6013&nwID=3484

[14] http://media.www.maroon-news.com/media/storage/paper742/news/2005/03/04/News/Peace.Studies.Professors.Research.Causes.Conflict-886076.shtml

[15] http://media.www.maroon-news.com/media/storage/paper742/news/2005/03/04/News/Peace.Studies.Professors.Research.Causes.Conflict-886076.shtml

[16] http://www.sa4c.com/documents/fontan_interview.htm

[17] http://www.sa4c.com/documents/fontan_interview.htm

[18] See http://meetingresistance.com

[19] Cockburn, P. "If there is no change in three months, there will be war again," *The Independent*. London: 2008.

[20] http://www.upsam.upeace.org.

[21] Fontan, V. (forthcoming). *Voices from Post-Saddam Iraq: Living with Terrorism, Insurgency and New Forms of Tyranny*. Westport, CT, Praeger Security International.

What is NATO for?

By Serge Halimi

Nicolas Sarkozy wanted his presidency to mark a break with the "French social model," recently restored to its former glory by the collapse of American-style financial capitalism. So did he determine to do away with another old French tradition, national independence? Although he had never expressed such an intention in his electoral campaign and even though he later made any French reintegration in NATO's joint military command structure conditional on strengthening European defense, Sarkozy effectively announced that General de Gaulle's policy decision had had its day.

The founder of the Fifth Republic left the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's joint military command 43 years ago, at a time when the Soviet Union held a number of European countries in its grip. So why – with what future wars in mind – should France decide to reverse that decision now, when the Warsaw Pact is history and many former members (Poland, Hungary, Romania and others) have joined NATO and the European Union?

Is it to secure billets for 800 French officers at NATO headquarters in Norfolk,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Virginia? Or to please Sarkozy's friends in the arms industry who hope to sell more military equipment now that France is back in line? Or persuade the Americans that Sarkozy can safely be admitted to the inner circle now that Paris is no longer running its own show? It's more likely that the Elysée hopes to take advantage of the widespread sympathy for the new U.S. president to finally lay an unforgivable piece of French effrontery to rest. It's the day when Paris dared take issue with all the Dr. Strangeloves and the "clash of civilisations" on the question of war with Iraq; the day when many of Sarkozy's current supporters, including the foreign minister Bernard Kouchner, disagreed with this independent stance. Most member states of the United Nations are not members of either NATO or the EU, and six EU member states (Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta, Sweden) do not belong to NATO either. But the roles of the three structures are becoming confused: the military organization is being assigned a geographical scope and entrusted with "stabilization" missions, for which it has no qualifications or jurisdiction.

On February 19, members of the European Parliament, claiming that they are slowly forming a worldwide human team (*une terre sans frontières*), passed a resolution by a small majority (293 to 283), referring to "phenomena such as international terrorism … organized crime, cyber threats, environmental deterioration, natural disasters and other disasters" and calling for "still closer partnership" between the EU and NATO. The explanatory note appended to the resolution sums the situation up in this image: "without a military dimension, the EU is like a barking dog without teeth."

The Atlantic Alliance will not hesitate to deploy its forces in combined civil and military missions extending far beyond the old Iron Curtain to the borders of Pakistan.

Leaving no stone unturned, the resolution also recalls our "painful history," referring to Hitler and Munich, quotes a few lines by "Elie Wiesel, holocaust survivor," and adds: "Wouldn't we want someone to come to our rescue when we are crying?" U.S. officers, however, have never had a great reputation for drying civilian tears. Neither during the war in Kosovo, nor in the Iraq War, both conducted in breach of the U.N. charter. But, regarding many member states at the U.N., the European Parliament profoundly regrets that "the doctrine of non-alignment, inherited from the cold war era, undermines the alliance of democracies".

So, it is understood that "the future collective defense of the European Union," to which the French head of state is committed, will be organized exclusively within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance. The Alliance will not hesitate to deploy its forces in combined civil and military missions extending far beyond the old Iron Curtain to the borders of Pakistan. Even within Sarkozy's own party, two former prime ministers, Alain Juppé and Dominique de Villepin, are already worried about this change of direction – evidence enough of the risks involved in taking such a course. **CP**

Serge Halimi is the director of *Le Monde Diplomatique*.

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Phone 1-800-840-3683 or visit our website to find out about CounterPunch's new books.

1st Class
Presort
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class

return service requested

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED